REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is hereby requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

The question raised by the Examiner with respect to priority on page 2 of the Office Action has been addressed by amending the specification.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite with respect to the terms "a light interactive material" and "a fiber". It is also stated that it is unclear what is meant by the term "flow range" and "an overlapping flow range".

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to overcome the objections with respect to the terms "a light interactive material" and "a fiber".

The Examiner is respectfully referred to page 4, beginning line 16, bridging page 5, including lines 1-25 of the specification where it is specifically stated that the flow ranges of the glasses overlap. It is submitted that this disclosure adequately supports the current claim language which literally means that there must some overlap between the respective flow ranges of the glasses in question.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection on indefiniteness with regard to claims 1 and 2 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Howard 4,575,187, with reference to claim 1-2 and col. 6, lines 55-56 of Howard. The rejection concludes that since the Howard process works and does the same thing that applicant does, Howard would get the same results.

It is respectfully requested that the rejections over Howard be reconsidered and withdrawn for the following reasons.

The reference to Howard neither teaches nor suggests the present invention. Howard is directed to a method of making a birefrignent, polarization preserving optical fiber and includes depositing a photo-resist layer and patterning said layer so as to form openings therein which are arranged circumferentially and which expose the under laying portions of the cladding layer. The process involves removing exposed portions of the cladding layer and removing the photo-resist layer thereby leaving on the interior surface a circumferentially patterned cladding layer which induces unsymmetric stress and birefrignent in the fiber upon subsequent collapse and drawing. It can be seen from the claims, disclosure and drawings of Howard, that Howard is not directed to nor does Howard teach a final product whereby the fiber is formed having a substantially continuous film of light interactive material formed

between the core and cladding throughout the entire length of the fiber as presently claimed in both of applicant's independent claims 1 and 2. For these reasons it is requested that the rejection over Howard be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Both independent claims 1 and 2 have been amended to state that the fiber resulting from the present invention is suitable to affect amplification, with both independent claims reciting that the flow range is in the temperature range of about 600-1500°C. It is submitted that the Howard reference does not appreciate this concept, and therefore is requested that the rejection over Howard be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above it is respectfully requested that the above rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and the instant application passed to issue at an early date.

If the Examiner wishes to expedite disposition of the above-captioned patent application, he is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0289.

Respectfully submitted,

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI LLP

By: _____

Owen D. Marjama
Reg. No. 22,818

ODM/cmh

Telephone: (315) 425-9000

Customer No.: 20874